



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## ANNUAL BANQUET<sup>1</sup>

The Shoreham Hotel, Thursday, December 30, 1915, 7 o'clock p.m.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, Toastmaster. Gentlemen of the American Society of International Law, gentlemen of the Pan-American Scientific Congress, and our guests: I can not refrain, in opening the post-prandial exercises of this evening, from expressing the great satisfaction which I feel in taking part in the transformation of the serious and sometimes dry exercises of our meetings into this social function. It is especially agreeable to me because I cherish such rich and precious memories of hospitality received from our South American guests.

I have said many times to my own countrymen, without ever provoking resentment on their part, that I wish they could all learn a lesson in courtesy and the generosity of friendship from our brothers in South America. I should have felt that my own participation in this Congress was imperfect and lacked an important element, if I could not have met you, my old friends of South America, in this gathering, which excludes the serious and the scientific, and seeks to cultivate and satisfy only the generous sentiments of friendship.

It is with very great pleasure that I announce to you all the completion of the first step in what I believe will be a very useful and important organization for united effort on the part of representatives of all the American nations in the direction of developing and strengthening the law of nations. You will recall that up to the time when the American Society of International Law was formed there had never been such a society in this wide world. The development of the law of nations was left to governments and to private individuals and to two great organizations which were international in their character, the Association of International Law and the Institut de Droit International, both of them founded in 1873.

---

<sup>1</sup>The banquet on this occasion was given by the Division of International Law of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to the delegates in attendance upon Section Six of the Second Pan American Scientific Congress, and to the Members of the American Society of International Law, the American Political Science Association and the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes.

But the first departure in the formation of a national society of international law, a society having a double aspect, one to promote the development of the law internationally and the other to educate and instruct the people of the particular nations in their knowledge of the law of nations, was that which was set in motion by our friend, Dr. James Brown Scott, some ten years ago.

The response, which I confess was to me far beyond expectation, of the people of this country to the efforts of that organization has demonstrated the practicability of such an institution; and the rapid changes in events have demonstrated year by year more cogently the necessity of such an institution. For if democracies are to take charge of government in international affairs, as they are taking charge of government in national affairs, it is of primary, of vital importance, that the people of every democracy shall learn their duties, as well as their rights, in their relations with each other. That can not be done by the meeting of a few savants to cultivate the mystery of international law. That can be done only by broadening out into societies within which shall be gathered the men of all callings, lovers of liberty and justice, who desire to do their duty as members of self-governing democracies, not alone toward themselves and their fellows, but toward all other nations. That can only be done by the creation of a great number of competent leaders of opinion who shall direct the impulses and the action of their neighbors and their fellow citizens in the performance of the duty of administering the affairs of nations by the rule of international justice.

The demonstrated success of this new departure of the Society of International Law has resulted in the formation of similar societies in Europe, and it has resulted, through much communication, correspondence, and intercourse, through the devoted efforts of Dr. Scott, through a personal visit paid by our friend, the former Ambassador to France, Robert Bacon, in the formation of a national society of international law in every American republic. Every one has its society, prepared to perform the great duty of instructing the people of the country in their international duties and in aiding the government of their country in its international intercourse.

Yesterday there was inaugurated an institute—the American Institute of International Law—which gathered together the representatives of all these national societies, twenty-one in number, which representatives were elected by each of the national societies, whose members are

eligible to be associate members of the Institute. Through that Institute there will be hereafter an institution for the expression and effectuation of the good will and love for peace and sense of justice of all the American countries with relation to each other.

Peace we all love; good will we all entertain; friendship we all feel. The nature of man is kindly; all the peoples of the earth prefer to be friends. But good will, friendliness and good understanding, because they have no institutions through which they may receive effect, stand powerless before sinister designs, schemes of aggrandizement, and the lust for power and wealth. Here in the Americas is created an institution through which the good will and friendliness of the American peoples may have voice and effectiveness.

Before we proceed let me say that it is the custom of this Society, honored so far as one decade can produce honor, to make its dinners short. We have aimed to close our dinners as nearly at half-past ten in the evening as possible in order that various individual schemes of enjoyment may not be cut off. I feel a special duty to enforce that principle tonight because it seems to me that unless great discretion is exercised this will be for us a farewell dinner, in view of the fact that by the 8th of January, to which day the program of this Scientific Congress extends, if you keep up the pace which you have been following for the last four days, you will all be dead.

Therefore, we will be brief. We will observe the custom of the Society; and in the pursuit of that laudable purpose, and in recognition of the duty and the pleasure of hospitality, it is my very great honor and pleasure to call upon a distinguished judicial officer of the great southern Republic of Argentina to address us. I have the pleasure of presenting to you, as the first speaker of the evening, Dr. Ernesto Quesada, the President of the delegation of Argentina to the Second Pan American Scientific Congress, and one of the great and most distinguished jurists of that noble country.

Dr. ERNESTO QUESADA. Gentlemen: As a Latin American, I have been chosen to answer, in a few words, the eloquent speech we have heard. May I profit by this unique opportunity to convey the general impression of what I understand is the public opinion in our republics, regarding the important topics of the Section on International Law at this moment?

Well, we all think, in the Southern Hemisphere, that this is perchance the most solemn and important moment in the life of civilized nations and that it represents a real turning point in history. The classical international law, framed alike by facts and doctrine in the ancient nations of Europe, has in effect committed suicide. The present terrible and sad experience shows that it was a sort of compromise, accepted always with the hidden thought that when the ambitions or the interests of those nations should conflict with it, it need not be observed. We, in America, have quite different international problems and our special geographical positions give to these a characteristically continental aspect. The old European international law is bankrupt: the new American international law will step in, in its place, as representing the modern tendencies of civilization, free from the entangling traditions that guide the policy of the nations of Europe.

Therefore, in this very important moment of history, America must hold upright this part of the social sciences and remodel it in order to give it permanent life, independent of the unavoidable fetters of the secular European tradition. This is the noble task that America must take energetically in its hands, combining the efforts of more than twenty nations. The United States, as the richest and most powerful of them all, as perhaps the most important nation in the whole world, with its hundred millions of citizens and its unbounded resources, must forcefully lead the way. We all think, in both American divisions of the hemisphere, that the pivot of civilization will in the future be this country and that, as a consequence, its statesmen—I mean those of the sort of Hamilton and Webster, in the past, and, if you will allow me to express the South American opinion clearly, of Mr. Root, in the present—must be aware of the extraordinary importance of this historic moment. We all have our eyes fixed on the White House, and, with respect to international matters, we follow anxiously all its moves.

But if we can, as men in the street, be merely lookers-on, we must, as men of science and in the meetings of our technical assemblies, as the American upholders of international law, try to find a doctrinal form of solving these difficulties. And I am positive that the questions already discussed, be it in official notes or in scientific proceedings, form only a very nominal part of the tremendous number of problems that the impending peace that one day or another must put an end to the present horrible struggle, will provide. The whole

body of international law must be reshaped, and possibly that will take place in America, especially here where we are meeting. Our American Institute has, then, a most extraordinary task to perform, and must not lose a moment in scrutinizing the details of all those burning problems; science particularly is entitled to do it with the greatest freedom, trying to look on things from the noblest and highest standpoint, and to draft the possible solutions in the most impartial and generous way.

The American Institute of International Law really represents the grandest idea of the most unselfish Pan-Americanism, and we in the southern part of the hemisphere regard the men who have taken on their shoulders such a gigantic work as veritable beneficiaries of humanity. We are anxious to coöperate in their work and only ask to be called upon to participate with our best will and to put all our energy in it. We have suffered terribly by the present war; we are in fact suffering still. All the economic foundations of civilized life have been shaken or shattered in pieces. Everything must be reconstructed.

Gentlemen, let us coöperate in that work in the most friendly spirit of real and unselfish Pan-Americanism. Do not try to solve these problems exclusively from the point of view of your own country. Remember that union is always force and that if you are a giant today, we also shall surely be a giant tomorrow. Let us proceed as kindred nations that have common problems: let our intellectual representative men stand close together in this most momentous reform of the basis of the life of nations, which will be incident to the framing of the international law of the future.

I drink, then, to the success of the loyal scientific coöperation of all the three Americas.

The TOASTMASTER. We may well feel that the spirit of man has broadened, that the conception of humanity has taken hold of the civilized peoples of the earth anew, when we remember that the system of international law a few generations ago was confined to the little group of countries occupying the continent of Europe; that when a new nation was created on the continent of North America by the American Revolution, that nation was admitted into the charmed circle of the family of nations coming from the outside; that when, at the last conference at The Hague all of the American Republics took their seats

in the great council of civilization, the circle of the law of nations was, for the first time avowedly and formally enlarged to cover the American continent. And when we remember the hundreds of millions who inhabit Asia with their old and high civilization, who have also come into the circle of the family of nations, the spirit of civilization broadening with the process, we, with our little hundred millions, thinking of ourselves, absorbed in the controversies between the Powers of Europe, finding the whole horizon obscured, are apt to forget that we are but a small part of the civilized peoples of the earth; but, due to the enlarged spirit which we may call the great, new departure for the establishment of a true law of nations that shall be binding and honored and observed, we shall recall China with its vast territory and its ancient civilization and its devotion to peace—the noblest principle of mankind.

I ask you, gentlemen of the American Republics, devoted to the establishment of law among the nations, to honor the Minister from China to the United States.

Dr. V. K. WELLINGTON Koo. When I reflect that this is a banquet primarily in celebration of the Pan American Scientific Congress, and that the majority of the guests are gentlemen from South America, I feel a little concerned in finding a reason for my presence here. I can not think of any reason but one, and that is, you recall from your history that China is the nation which invented the mariners' compass, and that in the Chinese mariners' compass the needle always points to the south.

After all, I have a reason for finding an excuse for my presence here. In 1832 the Government of the United States sent an eminent American gentleman to China, Edmund Roberts, to negotiate a treaty. When he went to Canton and asked for an interview with the Viceroy of Canton, he was refused recognition for the reason that his titles were but two inches long, whereas those of the Viceroy covered at least a foot. But Mr. Roberts was very ingenious. He said he had a title that possibly was longer than that of the Viceroy, but that having just arrived on the spot, he had hardly had time to find Chinese paper and a Chinese pencil to write out all of his titles. He said that if the Viceroy really insisted he would produce his full titles. So he asked for a piece of Chinese paper and a Chinese pencil. The Chinese secretaries were somewhat amazed when

he began to write. He said, "Edmund Roberts, of Portsmouth, of the State of New Hampshire, in the United States, namely"—and then he went on to name the different States. Before he got through with naming the various States of course the paper was all covered with writing, and he asked for another piece of paper. The Chinese secretaries said, "No, that is enough. Your title is already longer and greater than the titles of our Imperial Majesty, the King."

So the objection was overcome, although Roberts afterwards stated that he fully intended to proceed, after he had finished naming the States in the United States, to give the names of the lakes, the mountains and the rivers.

But, gentlemen, you do not have to produce your titles to enable me to recognize you. I deem it a great privilege to be able to stand, on this auspicious occasion, in this distinguished assemblage of international jurists. In my opinion no study can be more fascinating and more far-reaching than that of international law. Great questions of peace or war, of the welfare of society, involving as they do sometimes millions of lives, are often settled by mere reference to that comparatively small body of rules generally known as the law of nations. Questions of momentous interest come under your observation and examination, undisturbed by excitement and free from the influence of passion.

To a Chinese scholar the study of international law is of peculiar interest. China about a thousand years before the Christian era, presented many points of similarity to the state of Europe today. In those days the central government had become so weak that the provinces had become to all intents and purposes sovereign states, and the statesmen of those states had to deal with questions arising from the formation of alliances, the keeping of treaty obligations, questions relating to the balance of power, and the like.

It would be therefore interesting to compare the present international law with the rules of intercourse which existed approximately about three thousand years ago. But, gentlemen, I am not going to detain you on that historic subject. Let me avail myself of this opportunity to mention to you, in this connection, that the honor of introducing a systematic study of international law is due to Dr. William D. Martin, an American missionary, formerly president of the college in Pekin. His translation of Wheaton's "International Law" is still being used very extensively in China.

I am glad to announce that very recently a society similar to the American Society of International Law has just been formed in Pekin by a few Chinese scholars under the auspices of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. They plan to publish a journal which will be devoted especially to the extensive discussion of this important subject.

There are still some who would refuse to recognize international law as law at all; but I believe this view is shared by very few today. It is quite true that there have been times in different parts of the world, in the Far East as well as in the West, when the efficacy of international law as a bulwark of international justice has been tested and found wanting; but, gentlemen, I do not consider that that is the fault of the law itself. That is the fault of the age in which we live, an age in which nations are still suspicious of each other and hesitate to come together and coöperate in the creation and organization of some common body for the enforcement of the law of nations.

The mere fact that international law is occasionally violated is no reason for denying its existence, just as the occasional success of a criminal in evading the municipal law is no reason to deny the existence of the municipal law.

The purpose of all is to find an effective means for the enforcement of the law of nations. This is certainly a difficult task, a task which will probably take years, and possibly decades, but neither the time nor the difficulty should discourage us from our efforts to secure its attainment.

If we look back to the time of Grotius—or still nearer—if we look back a century ago and then compare it with today, we can not but realize the wonderful progress that has been made in the field of international law. Not to mention others, the conferences of Vienna and of Paris, the two Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907, have given us great contributions to the subject of international law; while the decisions which have been rendered by the Permanent Court of Arbitration within the few years since its establishment have given us ample evidence of what can be accomplished by intelligent, persistent and organized effort.

Gentlemen, I am very confident, if we can judge of what is to come by what has gone by, that we have every reason to think that the future of international law is as bright and as promising as it can be.

As you will notice by what I have said, I cherish the very strongest hopes for the future development of international law as the result

of your past study in this field, and I shall look with confidence for even greater results from your study of this important subject, invigorated as it must have been by the interesting meetings of the Pan American Scientific Congress now being held in this city of Washington.

The TOASTMASTER. His Excellency, Doctor Koo, seems to me to have given to us not only a most charming illustration of intellectual acumen and catholic understanding of our western world, but also an exhibition of something that we shall need very much if we are to play our part in the performance of the great task that will await the world when this cruel war is over—humility; humility—a realization of how small a part we really play in the time-long affairs of this great world.

It is my great pleasure to introduce to you as the next and last speaker of this evening the Honorable Charles H. Sherrill, formerly American Minister to Argentina, who has that sympathetic appreciation of our brethren in the Southern Hemisphere which comes from life among them, from knowledge of them, from affection for them, and from the obligations of friendship and hospitality.

Hon. CHARLES H. SHERRILL. Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Secretary of State, fellow guests and gentlemen: I am going to ask you to make a very rapid trip, if you will, from eight thousand years ago until tomorrow. No one appreciates more than I the opportunity of speaking to such an audience as this, which calls for brevity, and brevity means conciseness; for that reason, with your permission, I will read what I have to say.

Much is heard nowadays of two shibboleths, "America First" and "Safety First," generally assumed to be hopelessly incompatible. Let us reason together and see if we may not evolve a symmetrically complete foreign policy which will not only conserve the fine patriotism of "America First" but also square with the sound common sense of "Safety First." I believe that in this endeavor we have ready to our hand a great international force which shall not only advance the world position of all the Americas, but also will assure to their children's children the blessings of peace. That force is Pan-Americanism. To this audience it is not necessary either to explain or to eulogize Pan-Americanism, for if you were not already its staunch adherents you would not be here. You know its history and its upward progress,

you know where it stands today. My purpose tonight is to attempt to outline a plan, which, based upon the firm foundation of the Pan-Americanism of today, can utilize its force to guarantee the tomorrow of the Western Hemisphere. As I look out into the future this plan shapes itself to me as a complete triangle, a triangle for peace, whose base is an already operative system of joint mediation in all Pan American misunderstandings. The easterly side of the triangle is to eliminate friction with European Powers and thus keep us from becoming embroiled in their political disputes whose settlement lies beyond our arranging. The westerly side of the triangle shall safeguard peace on the Pacific by inoculating our policy there with the "stay at home and mind your own business" vaccine of the Monroe Doctrine. What is good medicine for us to give others ought to be good for us to take. If it shall seem best to set up this triangle, then with a policy so productive of peace at home and protection from attack from across both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, we of the New World may proceed calmly to the development of our untouched resources, a development which is to be the world's next great step forward.

Now let us consider this triangle and begin by a brief reference to its base, which fortunately is already securely established.

As a result of my two years stay in South America, with the facilities it gave for studying the point of view not only of the people in their everyday life, but also of the political and intellectual leaders of twenty republics assembled at several international conferences, I ventured to formulate a suggestion in January, 1913, that whenever international difficulties arose in this hemisphere the United States should always invoke the coöperation of one or more of our sister republics so that we might benefit from getting their Latin point of view of the problem, something we Anglo-Saxons had never done. Although this suggestion was unanimously approved by the three hundred Latin American newspapers to which it was cabled, so novel was it considered by our press as to receive much criticism, chiefly because it was pronounced unpractical. That was less than three years ago, and now it is an accepted system for adjusting interrepublican disputes that ought always to preserve peace among us, because now at last the Anglo-Saxon studies the viewpoint of the Latin so that the Latin no longer need distrust the Anglo-Saxon. Furthermore, it has made the Monroe Doctrine a continental one, so that our Latin friends no longer distrust the big brother of the North. It has justified itself

by the successful prevention of war between Mexico and the United States, effected by the joint mediation of Argentina, Brazil and Chile, and again and more recently (thanks to the present Administration) by the useful results of the joint mediation in the Mexican difficulties of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, the United States and Uruguay. This second operation is an improvement on the first because it strikes the true democratic note by rating the smaller nations as of the same importance as larger ones. So much for the base of our triangle, now securely laid with the cement of mutual respect for the other man's viewpoint, formerly so grievously lacking.

Now for the easterly side of our triangle. What is the danger which ever since the birth of our republic has always threatened us, the danger of which Washington warned, and against which Monroe spoke out to protect us? What is it but the risk of becoming embroiled in European politics and its quarrels. To prevent this, Monroe launched his doctrine against a future colonization by any European Power anywhere in the New World. He and our forebears thought this enough. They expressly refrained from interfering with existing European colonies here, and yet from the day Monroe sent his message to Congress until now there has never been a time when the crisis they all dreaded was so real and threatening as when in 1895 President Cleveland spoke out so splendidly to save Venezuelan territory from the encroachment of an English colony which had long existed. European colonies in this hemisphere tend to embroil us in European politics, and, therefore, even existing ones should be released from their European owners, and dangers like the Venezuela episode of 1895 eliminated for good and all. All the territory of all the Americas should be freed from European domination. This suggestion was made by me this autumn before the University of Buffalo, and editorial comment thereon was no more favorable than that upon my joint mediation suggestion of January, 1913, the criticism, curiously enough, again being that the idea was not practical. Let me show you that in this regard, just as in that of joint mediation, the advanced thought of Latin America leads that of our country. Just a year ago, after the naval battle off the Falkland Islands, the nations of South America united in a protest against such use of the waters of the New World and urged the neutralization of all Pan American waters. Although that joint South American protest of December, 1914, did not arouse much interest in this country, would it not have been vastly different if,

instead of a naval battle off the English base on the Falkland Islands, it had taken place off their base in British Honduras right by the mouth of our canal! Is it not obvious that the only way to rid us of the risk of future European battles on our side of the world is to eliminate all their naval and military bases? Suppose that in this war, England had not swept the seas of German shipping, would not Germany have attacked England's colonies over here, just as England has attacked German colonies in Africa, and in that case, would it not have been difficult for every Pan American republic to have escaped being embroiled!

With those who say that European colonies here are better off than they would be if free, I have no patience. Do such people know that in all the three Guianas, a territory the size of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa, there are less than 200 miles of railroad? Compare that with the 588 miles in Venezuela, next adjoining them, or the 614 miles in Colombia, and also compare the poor school facilities or none at all that characterize the three Guianas with the 1,700 schools of Venezuela or the 5,000 of Colombia. In British Guiana, the most advanced of the three Guianas, there are 10,000 whites, and 126,000 East Indian coolies and 115,000 negroes, all brought there for what purpose? To help advance the civilization of this hemisphere? or to exploit the land for their European masters? This East Indian coolie traffic was started in 1838 by John Gladstone, father of the great English Prime Minister. The French have brought many Siamese and Chinese into French Guiana, and the Dutch many Javanese into Dutch Guiana. French Guiana is chiefly known for its extensive penal settlements, in one of which Dreyfus languished so many hideous years. The foreign trade of the French Islands has steadily dropped, the annual totals from 1882 to 1907 showing for Martinique a fall from 67 to 34 million francs, and for Guadeloupe a fall from 68 to 29 million. The population of the Danish West Indies steadily decreased from 43,000 in 1835 to 31,000 in 1901.

In passing, let us remark that Canada stands in a very different case from all other European possessions here, because she is already self-governing, speaks the tongue of the mother country, and could have her entire freedom at any moment that she desired it. This is not true of the other colonies.

Just as the Mexican difficulty marked the right moment to launch the joint mediation suggestion, so I believe this to be the opportune

time to initiate the campaign for freeing all these colonies, because never before have the European governments owning them been in a position so to welcome the cash payment that we should be willing —nay, glad to offer for such freeing of Pan American territory. Such an altruistic act would ring especially true as coming from a nation that had spent millions in freeing Cuba. Furthermore, I am sure that many of the South American Powers would insist in participating with us in paying the few millions which the freedom of these colonies would cost. I say "few millions" advisedly, because almost none of these colonies are paying ones, while as naval bases they would only have value against us, a hypothesis too ridiculous to be figured in their sale price. Let us by all means complete the Monroe Doctrine, so that by eliminating the danger from existing as well as future European colonies we may achieve the peaceful seclusion we have sought ever since the days of Washington down to the South American plea of last December for the neutralization of Pan American waters. Thus will we erect on the firm base of assured peace within the New World the easterly side of the triangle to protect us from friction with Europe.

And now to complete that triangle by adding its westerly side, to make sure of a continuing peace on the Pacific. I think perhaps this is the first time that Pan-Americanism has turned its eyes in that direction. Unless I am mistaken, this completing side of the triangle is much more easily constructed and put into place than either of the other two. It all depends on whether or not we are willing ourselves to act as, through the Monroe Doctrine, we ask others to do. The basis of that Doctrine is the idea of "stay at home and mind your own business." For nearly a century we have preached that to all the outside world in regard to this hemisphere, but now we find that peace never can be assured on the Pacific until our sister nation Japan becomes convinced that what we preach on the eastern shores of that ocean we are willing to practice on the western. There is no use disguising the fact that many Americans feel that we are and ought to be the natural protector of China against what they call Japanese aggression. Until we definitely exorcise that international bogey we will never gain that complete confidence of Japan which will spell continued peace on the Pacific. We have a reasonable right to curb any and every outside nation from intruding on this side of the Pacific, but absolutely no right to interfere with their expansion on its other side, just

so long as it does not interfere with our treaty rights under "the most favored nation clause." Our efforts in China should be confined to what is outlined in the admirable notes of November 30, 1908, exchanged between Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, and Baron Takahira, the Japanese Ambassador: "supporting, by all pacific means at their disposal, the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire." Further than this we should neither go nor wish to go.

Let us consider from what sources spring this dangerous nonsense of our being the natural protector of China. One of its roots runs back into the distant past, to the days when the New England clipper ships traded so profitably with China, and brought back such cupidity-stirring tales of the fabulous wealth of the Far East. Thanks to that foolish legislation, the Reciprocity Act of 1828, which took away protection from our merchant marine, our ships disappeared from the seas, but the memory of those Chinese profits and the stories of Chinese commercial possibilities persisted. But what are the cold facts? The foreign trade of Latin America is eighteen times greater than that of China, and the foreign trade of Argentina alone almost equals that of China and Japan put together, and furthermore it is increasing at a greater rate.

But the chief cause of this "natural protector of China" nonsense is the very mistaken impression prevailing in our country concerning the "Open Door" in China which it is believed Mr. John Hay arranged by his clever series of communications sent September 6, 1899, to France, Germany, England, Russia, Italy and Japan, through our diplomatic representatives there, making an identical proposal to each, which he clinched by reporting to each of those governments March 20, 1900, that all the others had accepted his proposal. It was a brilliant diplomatic stroke and was supposed at the time not only to have opened the door in China, but to have fixed it open for all time. But what happened the very first time we started to use that door? The third clause of the Hay proposal dealt especially with the railroad situation in China, and yet when Mr. Knox, as Secretary of State, attempted to effect the neutralization of the Manchurian Railways, he found the open door locked and bolted. It is to be hoped that we shall always maintain our treaty rights in China along with those of other nations, but those who still believe that we have an open door there which will give us special privileges are dreaming an empty dream.

Let them awake to the fact that because the Monroe Doctrine forbids foreign intermeddling in the Western Hemisphere we should not intermeddle on the Asiatic side of the Pacific.

And this brings us to our one most vexed problem—the Philippines, and what to do with them. We hold those islands as the chance result of war, and not because of a lust for territory or any desire for a foothold in the Orient. But what is the Japanese viewpoint? How would we feel if Japan came into possession of some of the West Indian islands?—would it not affront the Monroe Doctrine? Why then should we be good Pan Americans only in the Caribbean Sea and not practice the same stay at home and mind your own business policy in the Orient? It is but natural for the Japanese to wonder how we can continue persistently to object to foreign colonization in the Western Hemisphere while we are actually in possession of large colonies near the coast of Asia. This Philippine problem is not at present being met in a way that is satisfactory to any of us. Why can not it be met so frankly that out of its very difficulties a valuable end can be evolved, just as from the Mexican imbroglio there emerged the Pan American mediation machinery, of so great value already, and certain to prove more valuable as it develops. Our possession of the Philippines does not true up to the underlying ideas of the Monroe Doctrine. But neither does the possession by Denmark, Holland, France and England of colonies in this hemisphere! Why not set one of these discordant facts off against the other, and trade the Philippine Islands for all European possessions to the south of us, and then turn the Guianas and British Honduras into free republics, return the Falkland Islands to Argentina, and take under our flag the West Indian Islands, so important to the defense of the Panama Canal. Thus at one step would we eliminate Japanese distrust caused by our holding the Philippines, honorably release us from the responsibility for those distant islands, complete the protection from European entanglements initiated by Monroe's protest against additional European colonization, and, finally, free us from European military bases near the Panama Canal.

This reference to the Canal leads me to say that in regard to that great waterway a state of affairs exists which also affronts the Monroe Doctrine and sorely needs readjustment, which readjustment should be included as part of our sale price of the Philippine Islands to our European friends.

We built the Canal with our own money and brains, after the French had tried in vain to do so. The only nation that contributed

anything to this great enterprise was England, and all that she contributed was her permission that we build it, at the same time restricting us by means of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty in our operation of it. The Clayton-Bulwer and the Hay-Pauncefote Treaties together form a monument to the superiority of English over American diplomacy and at the same time constitute an affront to our national dignity and to the territorial integrity of this hemisphere. That veteran diplomatist, General John W. Foster, once Secretary of State and father-in-law of our present Secretary, holds that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty "marks the most serious mistake in our diplomatic history, and is the single instance of a tacit disavowal or disregard of the Monroe Doctrine by the admission of Great Britain to an equal participation in the protection and control of a great American enterprise." Mr. John Hay, when Secretary of State, did his best to correct this state of affairs, and the result of his efforts was the first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, which was not approved by the United States Senate. By this one act alone the Senate amply justified its possession of the power granted it by our Constitution to accept or reject treaties. Mr. Hay renewed his efforts and negotiated a second treaty, which was approved by the Senate as the best that could be hoped for at the time. We must live up to that treaty until such time as England for compensation consents to its annulment. England now controls the Suez Canal and, although much French money went into its construction, still England also has large sums invested therein. But she managed to have us build the Panama Canal without a dollar of English capital being locked up therein. The French were outgeneraled by the English in the Suez Canal matter, but not so badly as we were in that of the Panama Canal. England can build and run ships cheaper than any nation, and therefore just so long as she can enforce equal canal tariffs she is safe in her shipping supremacy. We are all unwilling to lower to her level the wages paid those who build and navigate our ships, because it would reduce our workmen and sailors to a scale of living repugnant to all friends of American labor. We should insist upon a free hand in the Panama Canal, so that by preferential rates we can protect our own shipping and, in my own opinion even more important, we can protect that of our sister republics who share in the responsibilities of Pan-Americanism.

The annulment of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty should be made part of the sale price of the Philippine Islands.

So, gentlemen, is completed the drawing of the Pan American triangle of peace. Perhaps you will see it only as the dream of a dreamer, three dreams rolled into one. To this let me reply that one of the three dreams came true, so perhaps the others may also contain sterner stuff than "dreams are made of."

In any event, we will all agree that Pan-Americanism is the lineal descendant of the Spirit of '76, whose source was acknowledged by those armed Americans who at daybreak knelt in prayer on Cambridge Green before marching out to defend Bunker Hill against the assault of European domination.

The TOASTMASTER. Gentlemen, we have the great honor and pleasure of having at this table tonight the distinguished and able Secretary of State of the United States, the Honorable Robert Lansing, upon whose learning as an international lawyer, and upon whose poise of character and serene strength, the people of our country justly rely. He is here under a safe conduct, and is, therefore, by all the faith of treaties, relieved from the necessity of making any observations upon the remarks which have recently fallen from Mr. Sherrill.

Now, as we approach the conclusion of this festival, I shall ask you to join me in several appropriate toasts.

First, rise and drink to the President of the United States.

(The guests arose and drank a toast to the President of the United States.)

And now rise again, and drink to a toast to which I know every heart will respond in consonance with the intelligence of every guest at this board—the American Republics, one and indivisible, forever.

(The guests arose and drank a toast to the American Republics.)

And yet, again, join in a toast of broader import, to humanity, the universal concert of civilized nations, for the progress of civilization and the reign of peace in the world—to humanity, which the religion we all profess aims to make perfect—to peace and good will.

(The guests arose and drank a toast to humanity.)

Gentlemen, in behalf of the American Society of International Law, I thank you for honoring us by your presence this evening, and declare this meeting to be adjourned.